UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BRENT WADE SINGLETON,	
Petitioner,	8 8 8
versus	§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:23-CV-123
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-ID,	8 8 8
Respondent.	§ §

MEMORANDUM ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS AND ADOPTING THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Brent Wade Singleton, an inmate confined within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Correctional Institutions Division, proceeding *pro se*, filed this petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner challenges a conviction for aggravated assault on a public servant.

The court previously referred this matter to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, at Beaumont, Texas, for consideration pursuant to applicable laws and orders of the court. The magistrate judge has submitted a Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge recommending the petition be denied.

The court has received the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge, along with the record, pleadings, and all available evidence. Petitioner filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the court concludes the objections are without merit. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that the state court's rejection of his grounds for review was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law. Nor has he demonstrated that the state court's decision was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence. As a result, petitioner is not entitled to federal habeas relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).

ORDER

Accordingly, the objections filed by petitioner (#32) are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge (#31) is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered denying the petition.

Furthermore, petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a certificate of appealability is issued. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000); Elizalde v. Dretke, 362 F.3d 323, 328 (5th Cir. 2004). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues raised in the petition are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. See Slack, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner, and the severity of the penalty may be considered in making this determination. See Miller v. Johnson, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

In this case, the petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his grounds for review are meritorious is subject to debate amongst jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Thus, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 14th day of July, 2025.

Maria a. Crone MARCIA A. CRONE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE